

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Appended hereto as attachments are replacement formal drawing sheets to replace the drawing sheets that were included in the published PCT application. The PCT application drawing sheets have been amended to delete the PCT application and publication numbers at the top of each of the sheets, and also to substitute in Fig. 6 reference numeral 21 for reference numeral 20 that identifies a surface of rocker member 12. The reference numeral amendment responds to the examiner's objection to the drawings based on reference numeral 20 having previously been associated with two different features shown in Fig. 6.

Also appended hereto is a copy of the published PCT application drawings showing in red the drawing changes that are reflected in the attached replacement formal drawing sheets.

No new matter has been added to the drawings. Accordingly, approval and entry of the attached replacement drawing sheets is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

The substitute specification together with the amended claims and the replacement drawing sheets accompanying this Amendment place the present application in better form and overcome the formal objections and rejections.

The drawing objection has been overcome by the submission of the enclosed replacement drawings, which include an amendment to Fig. 6 so that reference numeral 20 appears only once

Claims 1 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 have been amended and placed in independent form, claim 7 has been amended, and new claim 8 has been added.

Claims 1-7 were objected to on the ground they included several informalities and that they were indefinite. And claims 1-3 were rejected on the ground no method steps were recited. In that regard, amended claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are believed to be in proper form, are definite, and comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1-7 were rejected as anticipated by the Turner '396 reference, and claims 2, 3, and 5-7 were additionally rejected as obvious based upon that reference. Amended method claims 2 and 3 each recite method steps for optimizing the plate geometry of a plate of a plate-link chain. Claim 2 relates to the longitudinal legs of the plate and claim 3 relates to the vertical legs of the plate. Similarly, claim 5 relates to the longitudinal legs of the plate and claim 6 relates to the vertical legs of the plate.

The Turner reference does not disclose a method or a plate in which the

plate geometry is such as to provide a minimum bending moment within either the longitudinal legs or the vertical legs of the plate, as is recited in the claims in the present application. Instead, Turner teaches balancing the stresses and the moments in the inner and outer links of a chain (see, e.g., Turner, col. 2, lines 32-34) that includes both thin links and more robust, or stronger, links in order “to better load distribution among the links” (Turner, col. 7, line 59). The Turner reference is thus not directed to determining minimum bending moments in the longitudinal and vertical legs of a link plate, as claimed in the present application, but to equalizing the load distribution in a plate link chain that includes thin plates and more robust plates.

In addition to being directed to a different form of chain, one having both thin and more robust plates that are installed in a particular pattern within the chain, the Turner reference does not teach the relationship between the plate geometrical attributes and the bending moments within the legs of the plate as claimed, nor does it teach or suggest modifying plate geometry to minimize the bending moments in the plate legs. The Turner reference is directed to balancing the loads across a chain, not to minimizing loads imposed on the plates of the chain. Moreover, the bending and bending moments discussed throughout the Turner reference are not plate leg bending moments, but are pin bending and pin bending moments, (see, Turner, col. 4, lines 44-47; col. 5, lines 17-19; col. 6, lines 27-29; and col. 7, lines 7-9). Therefore, the Turner reference neither discloses nor even remotely suggests the invention as it is claimed in claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.

New claim 8 is similar to claim 7 but depends from amended claim 6. The Turner reference does not disclose a factor k as recited in any of the claims of the present application.

Finally, an English-language Abstract of the Disclosure is attached on a separate sheet.

Based upon the specification, drawing, and claim amendments to this application, it is believed that the substitute specification, those claims that have been amended, and the replacement drawing sheets conform with all formal requirements. The claims as they now stand in the application are believed clearly to be allowable in that they patentably distinguish over the Turner reference that was cited and relied upon by the examiner, whether that reference be considered in the context of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested with a view toward the issuance of an early Notice of Allowance.

Should the examiner have any question after considering this Amendment, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney so that any such question can be quickly resolved in order that the present application can proceed toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Alfred J. Mangels
Reg. No. 22,605
4729 Cornell Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241
Tel.: (513) 469-0470

October 8, 2008